



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
Tel: 510.464.7700
TDD/TTY: 510.464.7769
Fax: 510.464.7848

Memorandum

TO: Planning and Operations Committee

DATE: October 5, 2001

FR: Executive Director

W.I.:

RE: Regional Transit Expansion Policy: Status

As you know, we are proceeding to develop a program of projects for the Regional Transit Expansion Policy (RTEP), which was adopted in April 2001, as Resolution No. 3357. The policy and its companion investment program are key elements of the overall 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), succeeding Resolution No. 1876 as the master strategy for rail and bus transit expansion in the region. Resolution No. 3357 included detailed criteria for evaluating projects.

Central to the RTEP is the Commission's objective to identify two tiers of projects:

- "Track 1" projects that would be included in the financially constrained 2001 RTP; and
- "Blueprint" projects that were not fully funded with identifiable revenue sources, but would represent priorities for new funding opportunities as they arose in the future.

It is the Commission's intent that a RTEP program of projects and funding strategy be adopted with the final RTP. This memorandum will discuss three major aspects in our on-going development of this program:

- Feedback we have received during our Phase 2 RTP public outreach program about the RTEP and the candidate projects included in the *Initial Assessment*;
- Evaluation and application of the Commission's adopted RTEP criteria in the development of a recommended program of projects;
- The status of current negotiations between BART and VTA regarding the proposed BART to San Jose project, and the impact that is expected to have in crafting an overall package of recommendations.

A. Feedback on the RTEP from the RTP Outreach Program.

A document titled *Regional Transit Expansion: Initial Assessment* was published in August 2001, which outlined the detailed descriptions of individual projects, and the project sponsor's comparison of the project against the criteria. It was clearly stipulated in the *Initial Assessment* that MTC staff was not conducting an independent criteria evaluation for the projects at that time. The purpose of the document was to outline what lead candidates project sponsors were advancing, and to pinpoint key issues that would need to be addressed in selecting among the candidate projects when developing an overall program.

As would be expected, many public comments to date have been directed at specific project preferences and dislikes. Particularly, many comments are directed at the BART to San Jose extension, including the Warm Springs extension segment; the Caltrain Downtown Extension and Transbay Terminal project proposals in San Francisco; the Muni Central Subway; and extension proposals in the Route I-580

(eastern Alameda) and Route 4 (eastern Contra Costa) corridors, including BART extensions and “t-BART”/ “e-BART” alternatives. The bulk and tenor of comments—positive and negative—are not surprising given the visibility of these projects, and the regional funding commitments they could represent. Detailed comments and responses are being documented as part of the RTP outreach process.

More important for this presentation are the comments related to the Commission’s overall approach to developing a final program for the RTEP. The major critical themes we have heard and our recommended response are as follows:

1. The RTEP process is moving too fast, and should be slowed to allow for on-going studies to be completed and incorporated into the process.

We believe that it is critical to have any regional strategy for transit expansion explicitly tied to our long-range plan. Among other things, the discipline inherent in the financially constrained requirements of the RTP forces the region to more clearly assess and articulate its priorities, essential when competing for discretionary funds at the federal and state level. In addition, our representatives in Congress have made clear their desire for MTC to forge a new transit expansion agreement as soon as possible in light of the forthcoming reauthorization of TEA 21.

We realize that several studies are underway which could better define the regional transit expansion projects that will be considered. Many of these studies will reach important milestones before completion of the RTP by the end of the calendar year, and we have made allowances to consider any clarifying information during the development of the program. Resolution No. 3357 itself makes it clear that MTC will periodically review and update the policy to account for new information and adjustments, as specific projects are refined. Approval of new funding sources as well as new information from completed studies could initiate such a review.

2. The RTEP criteria are good and represent an improvement over the past; however, it is not clear how they will be applied to the Commission’s decisions, particularly those criteria related to land use and cost-effectiveness.

The Commission took a significant step in adopting a multi-dimensional set of criteria for the Regional Transit Expansion Policy—one that received significant review and scrutiny prior to its adoption in Resolution No. 3357. An independent assessment of submitted candidate projects against the criteria is an important element in developing the final program, and the following section in this memorandum recommends a method for doing so.

3. The RTEP is only concerned with projects that can bring major funding to the table.

Resolution No. 3357 adopted both financial and performance-based criteria. Financial viability—both for capital investment and operations and maintenance—is an essential element in determining the capacity to actually implement a project. As such, it is one of several criteria that MTC will use to evaluate candidates for the Regional Transit Expansion Program. (See criteria discussion below).

4. Social justice concerns must be addressed in the process; the program is geared to wealthy riders only; the “lifeline” transit program being pursued by the MTC is just as important and should be integrated directly into the RTEP.

The Commission has been consistent in its commitment to developing two major transit improvement initiatives in tandem: an expansion of rail and bus networks oriented to increased mobility in congested corridors; and increased services for transit dependent persons. We expect improvements in the expansion program to benefit the lifeline services we identify, as they will provide mobility options for both transit dependent persons and commuters with automobile choices. The two

proposals are equally important, and both will be included in the RTP. However, because the evaluation criteria will be different for the expansion and lifeline programs—including considerations of cost-effectiveness and certain funding eligibilities—it is preferable not to merge the initiatives together. Instead, a parallel advocacy program must be developed for each, so priority consideration is given to both programs in pursuing and securing necessary funding, particularly in light of new opportunities such as ACA 4.

B. Application of Criteria

Resolution No. 3357 established criteria for including projects into the new Regional Transit Expansion program and funding strategy. Criteria are arrayed in basically two categories: financial and performance-based. In the *Initial Assessment*, Table A outlined the criteria in descriptive fashion. The next step is to evaluate each project according to the criteria to allow for a more informed comparison among the projects. Staff is currently receiving more detailed information from project sponsors in order to produce the evaluation, and we will have that information available for the Committee at its October 12th meeting. Below is the recommended evaluation protocol:

Financial:

Honor 1876 commitments: assigns relative priority to those projects of the original seven “Tier 1” Resolution No. 1876 projects that do not yet have a defined and secured financial agreement.

Rating: “yes” or “no” to indicate project is a Tier 1 1876 carry-over commitment.

TEA-21/federal reauthorization: indicates level of current federal financial support for the project.

Rating: “yes” or “no” to indicate project is included in current TEA-21 authorizing language for New Starts funding, or has other federal appropriation commitments.

TCRP/State commitments: indicates level of state financial commitment secured by the project.

Rating: “yes” or “no” to indicate project is currently funded with Traffic Congestion Relief Program funds, or other existing state funding commitments.

Dedicated local commitments: indicates level of local financial commitment to the project.

Rating: Assign a “high”, “medium” or “low” rating to the project, based on percentage of local funds to total capital costs, as follows:

“High”: Greater than 50%

“Medium” 30% to 50%

“Low”: under 30%

Operations/Maintenance: outlines necessary factors to ensure that the project can be maintained and operated once built. In addition, this criterion stipulates that the financial burden imposed by the transit expansion project may not undermine basic bus service within the same system, especially that needed by transit dependent persons.

Rating: “yes” or “no” depending on project sponsor’s identification of: a) a specific source or sources of operating and maintenance funds for the project; sources involving contributions of multiple local agencies must demonstrate support by those participating agencies; b) a financial plan that shows these funds are in place from time of estimated beginning of operations through the end of the RTP (2025) or for at least 10 years, whichever is longer. For sponsoring agencies operating rail as well as bus operations, or express bus as well as local bus operations, the financial plan must show that transit services are maintained to address the needs of transit dependent populations.

Performance based:

Land Use: establishes requirements for consistent assumptions of adjacent land uses along rail/bus corridors, and the ridership and other benefits that are assumed accrued as a result of those land uses.

Rating: Assign a “high”, “medium” or “low” rating to the project, based on year 2025 projected residential and employment land use densities around planned stations or transit centers as follows:

“High”: urban or urban core/CBD

“Medium” suburban

“Low”: rural or rural suburban

(see Attachment A for further details on ranges)

Cost-effectiveness: establishes two measures: “cost per new rider” and “transit user benefits” as measures of effectiveness.

Rating: for Cost per new rider, Assign a “high”, “medium” or “low” rating to the project, based on range of \$ per new rider (i.e. shift from auto to transit; not transit to transit), as follows:

“High”: \$0 - \$15/new rider

“Medium”: \$16 - \$30/new rider

“Low”: over \$30/new rider

The Federal Transit Administration, which defines the new “transit user benefit” criterion, has not yet provided the needed methodology for calculating the second cost-effectiveness measure; therefore, it will not be available for this analysis. We are evaluating a partial benefit measure of travel time saving that may be applied in our comparative analysis until such time that the FTA methodology for transit user benefit is available.

System Connectivity: outlines factors that define the interconnected relationship of the transit expansion and the existing transit network.

Assess connections/frequency/gap closures:

Rating: assign a “high”, “medium”, “low” rating to two factors, as follows:

A. Number of Connecting Operators:

“High”: 5 or more

“Medium: 3 to 4

“Low: 1 to 2

B. Frequency: Peak Period Headways

“High”: 10 minutes or less

“Medium”: 20 minutes to 11 minutes

“Low”: Greater than 20 minutes

C. Gap Closures

Rating: Assign “yes” or “no” to project based on whether it completes a major closure in the regional network.

System Access: outlines factors that determine the ability of users to easily access (via walking, biking, auto or transit transfers) the new extensions.

Rating: assign a “high”, “medium”, “low” ranking to number of modal access option:

“High”: 4 or more

“Medium: 3

“Low: 1 to 2

Project Readiness: establishes a priority for those projects that are able to proceed expeditiously to implementation.

Rating: Assign a "high", "medium" or "low" rating to the project, based on pre-construction activities completed or in progress as of December 2001, as follows:

"High": corridor evaluation+environmental analysis+preliminary design and engineering

"Medium": corridor evaluation+environmental analysis

"Low": Nothing or corridor evaluation only

C. BART-VTA Negotiations: Status regarding the BART to San Jose Project

Considerable debate has centered on a proposed extension of BART in the Fremont/South Bay corridor, including the Warm Springs extension—a carry-over commitment from Resolution 1876—and the Santa Clara segment extending to downtown San Jose and Santa Clara, for which the recently passed Santa Clara Measure A sales tax pledged \$2.0 billion. A major element attached to this project is the fact that it would extend beyond the current BART District boundaries, triggering a need for either annexation of Santa Clara County into the BART district according to established statutory procedures, or a financial and operating agreement between the BART and Santa Clara representatives to provide for operation outside the District boundaries, following the precedent established for the BART-SFO extension in San Mateo County.

Such a negotiated agreement also entails consensus among many key interests should this project emerge as part of the region's next generation of transit expansion projects. Particularly, this consensus would address decisions for the assignment of assumed discretionary funds identified in the 2001 RTP: federal section 5309 New Starts, Regional Measure 1 regional rail extension, and federal section 5309 discretionary bus capital funds. Therefore, we believe the Commission's stipulation that a negotiated agreement be reached between BART and VTA before the BART to San Jose project can be included in the RTP is a prerequisite for that project.

To date, negotiations have been proceeding between the two parties, but at a slow pace. In order to allow sufficient time for the negotiations to come to closure, MTC Chair Sharon Brown has notified the chairpersons of BART and VTA that we are willing to extend the final adoption of the 2001 RTP to December 19. However, a negotiated agreement must be reached by November 19, 2001 to consider including the BART to San Jose project as part of the 2001 RTP (see attached letters in Attachment B).

Steve Heminger

ATTACHMENT A - Regional Transit Expansion Policy DRAFT Criteria Evaluation Matrix

TRACK 1			Resolution 1876-Tier 1	TEA-21 Funds	TCRP	Dedicated Local Funding	Operations/ Maintenance	Supportive Land Use		Cost- Effectiveness	System Connectivity			System Access	Project Readiness
Project	Sponsor	Project Cost 2001 \$ Millions	prior 1876 Tier 1 commitment	TEA-21 authorization or other federal appropriations	TCRP or other state level commitments	Local funds as a percent of total capital cost	Demonstrated 10- year operating plan	Residential densities around stations	Employment densities around stations	Cost per new transit rider	# connecting operators	Frequency	Regional gap closures	# of modal access options	# of pre-construction activities completed or in progress
BART to Warm Springs	BART	\$ 634	Yes	Yes	Yes	H	Yes*	M	M	M	M	H	No	H	M
BART: Warm Springs to San Jose	VRTA	\$ 3,710	No	Yes	Yes	H	Yes*	H	M	M	H	H	Yes	H	L
MUNI 3rd St. LRT Phase 2 - New Central Subway	SFCTA/Muni	\$ 647	No	Yes	Yes	M	Yes*	H	H	L	H	H	No	H	H
BART/Oakland Airport Connector	BART	\$ 232	No	Yes	No	M	Yes	M	M	H	M	H	Yes	H	M
Caltrain Downtown Extension/Rebuilt Transbay Terminal	SFCTA	\$ 1,885	Yes	Yes	No	H	Yes*	H	H	L	H	H	Yes	H	M
Caltrain Rapid Rail/Electrification	JPB	\$ 602	No	No	No	H	Yes	M	H	L	H	M	No	H	M
Caltrain Express: phase 1	JPB	\$ 127	No	No	Yes	L	Yes*	M	H	H	H	M	No	H	H
Downtown East Valley: Light Rail and Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1 and 2	VRTA	\$ 500	No	No	No	H	Yes*	H	M	L	H	H	No	H	M
Capitol Corridor: Phase 1 Expansion	CCJPA	\$ 129	No	No	Yes	L	Yes	H	M	H	H	L	No	H	M
AC Transit Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit: Phase 1 (Enhanced Bus)	AC Transit	\$ 151	No	No	No	L	Yes*	H	H	H	L	H	No	H	L
Regional Express Bus Phase 1	MTC/Operators	\$ 40	No	No	Yes	L	Yes	-	-	H	M	-	Yes	H	H

BLUEPRINT			Resolution 1876-Tier 1	TEA-21 Funds	TCRP	Dedicated Local Funding	Operations/ Maintenance	Supportive Land Use		Cost- Effectiveness	System Connectivity			System Access	Project Readiness
Project	Sponsor	Project Cost 2001 \$ Millions	prior 1876 Tier 1 commitment	TEA-21 authorization or other federal appropriations	TCRP or other state level commitments	Local funds as a percent of total capital cost	Demonstrated 10- year operating plan	Residential densities around stations	Employment densities around stations	Cost per new transit rider	# connecting operators	Frequency	Regional gap closures	# of modal access options	# of pre-construction activities completed or in progress
Dumbarton Rail	JPB	\$ 129	No	No	No	H	No	M	M	L	H	L	Yes	H	L
BART/East Contra Costa Rail Extension**	CCTA	\$ 345	No	No	No	L	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	L
BART/Tri-Valley Rail Extension**	ACCMA	\$ 220	No	No	No	L	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	L
Altamont Commuter Express (ACE): service expansion	ACE	\$ 121	No	No	No	L	Yes*	M	M	H	M	L	No	M	-
Capitol Corridor: Phase 2 Enhancements	CCJPA	\$ 434	No	No	Yes	L	Yes	H	M	-	H	L	No	H	M
Sonoma-Marin Rail	SMART	\$ 200	No	No	Yes	L	No	L	M	-	H	L	No	H	L
AC Transit Enhanced Bus: Hesperian/Foothill/MacArthur corridors	AC Transit	\$ 90	No	No	No	L	Yes*	H	M	H	L	H	No	H	-

* Further detail is required from the project sponsor to fully satisfy this criteria.
** These projects are bifurcated in the RTEP financial plan to include right-of-way in Track 1 and construction in the Blueprint.

ATTACHMENT A - Regional Transit Expansion Policy Evaluation - Financial Criteria

TRACK 1			Resolution 1876- Tier 1	TEA-21 Funds	TCRP	Dedicated Local Funding	
Project	Sponsor	Project Cost 2001 \$ Millions	prior 1876 Tier 1 commitment	TEA-21 authorization or other federal appropriations	TCRP or other state level commitments	(2001 Million \$)	Percent Local Funds (Local \$/Total \$)
BART to Warm Springs	BART	\$ 634	Yes	Preliminary engineering	\$760 million for BART to San Jose corridor	\$ 350	55%
BART: Warm Springs to San Jose	VTA	\$ 3,710	No	Preliminary engineering	\$760 million for BART to San Jose corridor	\$ 2,262	61%
MUNI 3rd St. LRT Phase 2 - New Central Subway	SFCTA/Muni	\$ 647	No	Phase 1 Design/Construction	\$140 million	\$379 Phase 1	36%
BART/Oakland Airport Connector	BART	\$ 232	No	Preliminary engineering	No	\$ 112	48%
Caltrain Downtown Extension/Rebuilt Transbay Terminal	SFCTA	\$ 1,885	Yes	Federal Earmark (\$9 million) for the Transbay Terminal	No	\$ 1,538	82%
Caltrain Rapid Rail/Electrification	JPB	\$ 602	No	No	No	\$ 345	57%
Caltrain Express: phase 1	JPB	\$ 127	No	No	\$127 million	\$ 0	0%
Downtown East Valley: Light Rail and Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1 and 2	VTA	\$ 500	No	No	No	\$ 500	100%
Capitol Corridor: Phase 1 Expansion	CCJPA	\$ 129	No	No	\$28 million in TCRP funds.	\$ 0	0%
AC Transit Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit: Phase 1 (Enhanced Bus)	AC Transit	\$ 151	No	No	No	\$ 23	15%
Regional Express Bus Phase 1	MTC/Operators	\$ 40	No	No	Yes	\$ 0	0%

BLUEPRINT			Resolution 1876- Tier 1	TEA-21 Funds	TCRP	Dedicated Local Funding	
Project	Sponsor	Project Cost 2001 \$ Millions	prior 1876 Tier 1 commitment	TEA-21 authorization or other federal appropriations	TCRP or other state level commitments	(2001 Million \$)	Percent Local Funds (Local \$/Total \$) (1)
Dumbarton Rail	JPB	\$ 129	No	No	No	\$ 117	91%
Extension(2)	CCTA	\$ 345	No	No	Potential funds - residual from TCRP study	\$ 59	17%
BART/Tri-Valley Rail Extension(2)	ACCMA	\$ 220	No	No	Potential funds - residual from TCRP study	\$ 57	26%
Altamont Commuter Express (ACE): service expansion	ACE	\$ 121	No	No	\$37 million in TCRP and State Budget Act funds for previous project phase.	\$ 32	26%
Capitol Corridor: Phase 2 Enhancements	CCJPA	\$ 434	No	No	Yes	\$ 0	0%
Sonoma-Marin Rail	SMART	\$ 200	No	Federal earmark was for another project element	\$37 million in TCRP and \$28 million in Proposition 116 funds.	\$ 0	0%
AC Transit Enhanced Bus: Hesperian/Foothill/MacArthur corridors	AC Transit	\$ 90	No	No	No	\$ 0	0%

- (1) Except for the Dumbarton Rail project, capital funding for the Blueprint projects is only partial; total local contributions may change once full funding plans are in place.
- (2) These projects are bifurcated in the RTEP financial plan to include right-of-way in Track 1 and construction in the Blueprint.

ATTACHMENT A - Regional Transit Expansion Policy Evaluation: Performance-Based Criteria (O&M and Cost-Effectiveness) (* indicates caveats; see accompanying notes)

TRACK 1			Operations and Maintenance		Cost-Effectiveness			
		Project Cost 2001 \$ Millions	Annual Operating Cost (Millions)	Notes on Sustainability	Annualized Capital and Net Operating Cost (Millions)	Estimated New Daily Transit Riders (2020)	Cost per New Transit Rider	Notes/Source of Data
Project	Sponsor							
BART to Warm Springs	BART	\$ 634	\$ 9.2	SRTP suggests potential to fund within projected budget; BART still finalizing funding strategy.	\$ 54.5	see below	see below	Ridership information for this project has not been updated since 1991 study. Calculated cost effectiveness for entire corridor as described below.
BART: Warm Springs to San Jose	VTA	\$ 3,710	\$ 63.0	Financial agreement for San Jose segment operations approved 11/9/01 by VTA and 11/13/01 by BART	\$ 321.4	60,600* (entire corridor)	\$20.34 (entire corridor)	Ridership and costs are from 2001 VTA Status Report #4. It is important to note ridership estimates are based on 2025 and assume completed BART to Warm Springs segment with its attendant cost and ridership generations.
MUNI 3rd St. LRT Phase 2 - New Central Subway	SFCTA/Muni	\$ 647	\$ 8.7	Financial plan for operations will require further Board action; strategy outlined.	\$ 59.1	5,100	\$ 38.60	Ridership based on 2000 Blueprint analysis.
BART/Oakland Airport Connector	BART	\$ 232	\$ 5.8	Operating plan shows ability to operate at profit.	\$ 14.4	14,200	\$ 3.11	Ridership numbers are taken from Oakland Airport Connector Final EIR/EIS. Horizon year is 2020 and incremental riders are estimated.
Caltrain Downtown Extension/Rebuilt Transbay Terminal	SFCTA	\$ 1,885	Not available	Total operating cost not provided; net operating revenues anticipated for Transbay Terminal.	\$ 151.9	10,000*	50.62	Ridership assumptions provided by SFTA (Parsons Brinkerhoff report-Oct. 2001). 10,000 new riders are assumed for the extension element; no new riders are forecast to be generated by the new facility alone. Assignment of riders to only the extension cost would result in a cost/new rider of \$22.81.
Caltrain Rapid Rail/Electrification	JPB	\$ 602	\$ 0	No additional operating cost expected.	\$ 48.5	5,000	\$ 32.33	Blueprint assumes 20,000 new transit riders for a project that included grade separations, electrification, Downtown Extension, and Express. 5,000 of the new riders are assumed from the electrification element.
Caltrain Express: phase 1	JPB	\$ 127	\$ 23.8	No additional operating cost expected.	\$ 34.0	15,000	\$ 7.56	Blueprint assumes 20,000 new transit riders for a project that included grade separations, electrification, Downtown Extension, and Express. JPB estimates 15,000 new riders for the Express element in 2020.
Downtown East Valley: Light Rail and Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1 and 2	VTA	\$ 500	\$ 8.3	Financial plan for operations will require further Board action; strategy outlined.	\$ 50.0	5,100	\$ 32.16	Ridership estimates taken from 2002-2011 Short Range Transit Plan; Notice of Preparation of an EIS and Refined Evaluation of Conceptual Alternatives.
Capitol Corridor: Phase 1 Expansion	CCJPA	\$ 129	\$ 33.3	State funds expected.	\$ 21.4	6,000	\$ 11.86	Ridership provided by CCJPA for 16-round trips daily. Horizon year is 2020.
AC Transit Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit: Phase 1 (Enhanced Bus)	AC Transit	\$ 151	\$5.8 net of fares	SRTP suggests potential to fund within projected budget; project specific financial plan not yet available.	\$ 27.8	7,700	\$ 12.05	Ridership source is AC Transit 2001 MIS report.
Regional Express Bus Phase 1	MTC/Operators	\$ 40	\$5.3 Phase 1	SRTPs suggest potential to fund within projected budget; operators committed to sustaining operations as part of funding application.	\$7.7 Phase 1	-	\$8.45 Phase 1&2	Capital cost and operating costs from express bus program applications. New transit riders not estimated for Phase 1; therefore, cost-effectiveness for Phase 1&2 taken from 2000 Blueprint.

BLUEPRINT			Operations and Maintenance		Cost-Effectiveness			
		Project Cost 2001 \$ Millions	Annual Operating Cost (Millions)	Notes on Sustainability	Annualized Capital and Net Operating Cost (Millions)	Estimated New Daily Transit Riders (2020)	Cost per New Transit Rider	Notes/Source of Data
Project	Sponsor							
Dumbarton Rail	JPB	\$ 129	\$ 5.5	Operating funds are not currently identified.	\$ 14.9	1,100	\$ 45.21	Ridership as estimated in 2000 Blueprint.
BART/East Contra Costa Rail Extension**	CCTA	\$ 345	\$ 6.5	BART staff indicates ability to cover incremental operating cost; project specific financial plan not yet available.	\$ 33.5	-	-	Ridership information not available, pending completion of studies.
BART/Tri-Valley Rail Extension**	ACCMA	\$ 220	\$ 5.0	BART staff indicates ability to cover incremental operating cost; project specific financial plan not yet available.	\$ 21.5	-	-	Ridership information not available, pending completion of studies.
Altamont Commuter Express (ACE): service expansion	ACE	\$ 121	\$ 6.5	SRTP suggests potential to fund within projected budget; funding not yet identified by partner agencies.	\$ 11.9	6,200	6.83	All required environmental analysis/clearances secured; the addition of train service is categorically exempt.
Capitol Corridor: Phase 2 Enhancements	CCJPA	\$ 434	\$ -	No incremental operating cost associated with Phase 2 enhancements	-	-	-	No information provided.
Sonoma-Marin Rail	SMART	\$ 200	\$ 7.0	Operating funds are not currently identified.	\$ 21.1	-	-	Start-up project scope differs significantly from that assumed in the 2000 Blueprint analysis. No updated ridership estimates of new transit riders are available.
AC Transit Enhanced Bus: Hesperian/Foothill/MacArthur corridors	AC Transit	\$ 90	\$7.1 net of fares	Operating funds are included in budget beginning in FY 2003/04	\$ 18.5	18,100	\$ 3.40	Letter from AC Transit dated November 5, 2001.

** These projects are bifurcated in the RTEP financial plan to include right-of-way in Track 1 and construction in the Blueprint.

Notes: 1) Studies are not included in the criteria evaluation. 2) "--" indicates that the information is not available.

ATTACHMENT A - Regional Transit Expansion Policy Evaluation: Performance-Based Criteria (Other)

TRACK 1			Supportive Land Use		System Connectivity			System Access	Project Readiness
Project	Sponsor	Project Cost 2001 \$ Millions	Residential land densities around stations	Employment land densities around stations	# connecting operators	Frequency (during peak)	Regional gap closure notes	# of modal access options	# of pre-construction activities completed or in progress
BART to Warm Springs	BART	\$ 634	Suburban	Suburban	BART, AC Transit, VTA	6 minutes peak 6 minutes off-peak	not closing gap	bus, ped, bike, parking	Corridor analysis completed November 2001; environmental underway.
BART: Warm Springs to San Jose	VTA	\$ 3,710	Urban	Suburban	AC Transit, VTA, Caltrain, San Jose Airport, Amtrak, Highway 17 Express	6 minutes peak 6 minutes off-peak	completes rail link in Fremont/South Bay corridor	bus, ped, bike, parking, rail	Corridor analysis completed November 2001
MUNI 3rd St. LRT Phase 2 - New Central Subway	SFCTA/Muni	\$ 647	Urban Core	Urban Core	Muni, BART, AC Transit, Caltrain, Golden Gate Transit, Amtrak, SamTrans	10 minutes	not closing gap	bus, ped, bike, parking	Environmental completed; Preliminary engineering underway
BART/Oakland Airport Connector	BART	\$ 232	Suburban	Suburban	BART, AC Transit, Capitols, Oakland Airport	3 minute peak	completes rail link to Airport	bus, ped, bike, parking	Completed environmental
Caltrain Downtown Extension/Rebuilt Transbay Terminal	SFCTA	\$ 1,885	Urban Core	Urban Core	Muni, AC Transit, Golden Gate Transit, SamTrans, Greyhound	< 5 minutes for all modes	completes rail link from Peninsula to downtown SF	bus, rail, ped, parking, bike	EIR/EIS underway
Caltrain Rapid Rail/Electrification	JPB	\$ 602	Suburban	Urban	BART, Muni, VTA, Capitols, ACE, SamTrans	15 minutes	not closing gap	bus, ped, bike, parking	Completed environmental
Caltrain Express: phase 1	JPB	\$ 127	Suburban	Urban	BART, Muni, VTA, Capitols, ACE, SamTrans	15 minutes	not closing gap	bus, ped, bike, parking	Project out for bid
Downtown East Valley: Light Rail and Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1 and 2	VTA	\$ 500	Urban	Suburban	VTA, Capitols, Caltrain, Amtrak, ACE	10 minutes	not closing gap	bus, rail, ped, bike, parking	Completed MIS; EIR underway
Capitol Corridor: Phase 1 Expansion	CCJPA	\$ 129	Urban	Suburban	BART, AC Transit, Solano County operators, VTA, ACE	60 minutes	not closing gap	bus, rail, ped, bike, parking	Environmental minor due to exemption criteria
AC Transit Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit: Phase 1 (Enhanced Bus)	AC Transit	\$ 151	Urban	Urban Core	BART, other AC Transit routes	10 minute peak and off-peak	not closing gap	bus, rail, ped, bike	Completed MIS
Regional Express Bus Phase 1	MTC/Operators	\$ 40	-	-	BART, Capitols, VTA, Vallejo Ferry	various	some gap closures on specific routes	bus, ped, bike, parking	Procurement underway

BLUEPRINT			Supportive Land Use		System Connectivity			System Access	Project Readiness
Project	Sponsor	Project Cost 2001 \$ Millions	Residential land densities around stations	Employment land densities around stations	# connecting operators	Frequency (during peak)	Regional gap closure notes	# of modal access options	# of pre-construction activities completed or in progress
Dumbarton Rail	JPB	\$ 129	Suburban	Suburban	ACE, BART, AC Transit, SamTrans, Caltrain	30 minutes	completes rail link across Dumbarton Bridge	bus, rail, ped, bike, parking	Conceptual studies only
BART/East Contra Costa Rail Extension**	CCTA	\$ 345	-	-	-	-	not closing gap	-	Project in study phase
BART/Tri-Valley Rail Extension**	ACCMA	\$ 220	-	-	-	-	not closing gap	-	Project in study phase
Altamont Commuter Express (ACE): service expansion	ACE	\$ 121	Suburban	Suburban	BART, VTA, LAVTA, Amtrak	60 minutes	not closing gap	bus, parking, shuttles	No information available
Capitol Corridor: Phase 2 Enhancements	CCJPA	\$ 434	Urban	Suburban	BART, AC Transit, Solano County operators, VTA, ACE	60 minutes	not closing gap	bus, rail, ped, bike, parking	Environmental minor due to exemption criteria
Sonoma-Marin Rail	SMART	\$ 200	Rural-Suburban	Suburban	Golden Gate Transit, 5 Sonoma operators	45 minutes	not closing gap	bus, ped, bike, parking	Environmental to begin early 2002
AC Transit Enhanced Bus: Hesperian/Foothill/MacArthur corridors	AC Transit	\$ 90	Urban	Suburban	BART, other AC Transit routes	10 - 15 minutes	not closing gap	bus, ped, bike	No information available

Notes: 1) Studies are not included in the criteria evaluation. 2) "--" indicates that the information is not available.